

c.) Remarks

Claims 1 and 7 have been amended in order to recite the present invention with the specificity required by statute. The subject matter of the amendment may be found in the claim as originally filed. Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

The Examiner objected to the replacement drawings and the amendment to specification pages 16-17 filed June 26, 2009 for the formal reasons noted at page 2 of the Office Action. In response, a new sheet of replacement drawings has been prepared and is attached as kindly suggested by the Examiner. Additionally, the language at specification pages 16-17 is amended in conformity therewith. The Examiner's assistance and cooperation in resolving these issues and thereby expediting the prosecution of this application is gratefully appreciated.

Claims 1-3 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner agrees the specular reflection layer may be installed within the light-reflective sheet, but not that it overlaps the light-reflective sheet. Similarly, claims 1-3 and 7-9 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In this regard, the Examiner states it is unclear how the auxiliary substrate is capable of wrapping around the display device, and objects to the term "surface protection". In response, the claims have above been amended in conformity with the Examiner's kind suggestions. Accordingly, these rejections are overcome.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Hingsen-Gehrmann (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0142121) in view of Yamamoto (U.S. Patent

Publication No. 2002/0036359), both of record, and Chirhart (U.S. Patent No. 4,919,741), newly cited. Claims 2, 3 and 7-9 are rejected as being obvious over this art in view of Mimura (WO 02/103629), of record. The Examiner's bases for this rejection is set forth at pages 4-9 of the Office Action.

Previously, Applicant explained the present invention recites a theft-resistant display device wherein the auxiliary substrate is larger than and can wrap-up the display device, which subject matter was not taught or suggested by the combined cited art. In response, the Examiner has cited Chirhart. In support of the rejection, the Examiner states (page 6, last line to page 7, line 6)

It is clear from the [Chirhart's] Figure that the auxiliary substrate is a size larger than said display device and the auxiliary substrate is capable of wrapping around or wrapping-up said display device. This article is a license plate (col. 1, lines 15-17), which will be installed somewhere on a car, typically a bumper. The fact that a license plate is installed, i.e., mechanically fixed, on a car or a car bumper is intrinsic in the reference and would be known to those of ordinary skill in the art. The car or its bumper would read on applicants' installation substrate. (Emphasis added.)

Applicant agrees Chirhart shows retroreflective sheeting 12 adhered to the bounds of number plate 14. However, Chirhart does not teach the constitution that a number plate is adhered to an auxiliary substrate. According to such constitution as in the present invention, it is difficult to remove the number plate once installed in the auxiliary substrate. Although the Examiner mentioned that the car (or its bumper) would read on Applicant's installation substrate, the auxiliary substrate -- which also is a constituent

feature of this invention -- is clearly different from a car bumper in constitution as is clear from Applicant's disclosure.

Respectfully submitted, such auxiliary substrate is neither taught nor suggested in the prior art.

Claims 1-3 and 7-9 are directed to an invention not patentably distinct from claims 1-5 and 8-10 of commonly assigned Application No. 10/569,869 taken alone or in view of Chirhart, taken in view of Chirhart and Mimura, or taken in view of Shimizu and Mimura.

As to this provisional rejection, the present application is the earlier-filed application. Accordingly, Applicant notes the provisional rejection but no response is necessary until the '869 application issues. Absent that event, if this application is otherwise in allowable condition, the rejection should be withdrawn herein. MPEP §804(I)(B)(1).

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all of the Examiner's concerns are now overcome and the claims are now in allowable condition. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application is earnestly solicited.

Claims 1-3 and 7-9 remain presented for continued prosecution.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Lawrence S. Perry/
Lawrence S. Perry
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 31,865

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

LSP\ac

FCHS_WS 4587900_1.DOC